

TUCSON EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
June 7, 2017
4:30pm, 3230

MEETING ATTENDEES			
Voting Members	*	Resource Members	*
Kristopher Abbate	X	Susan Ellis	
Elle Campbell		Sonia De Leon	X
Maria Czuzak	X	George Fantry	X
Herman Gordon		Carlos Gonzales	
Sarah Harris		Raquel Givens	X
Wendi Kulin		Kevin Moynahan	X
Patricia Lebensohn		Diane Poskus	X
Lindsey Lepoidevin		Karen Spear Ellinwood	
Bill Marshall	X	Amy Waer	
Art Sanders	X	Paul Weissburg	X
Sydney Rice		Violet Siwik	
Jordana Smith			
Kathy Smith	X	Special Guests	
Jim Warneke		Mike Gura	X
Stephen Wright	X	Travis Garner	X
Chad Viscusi			

*X = present

MEETING NOTES

1. Announcements/Reminders:

Dr. Sanders' reminded the committee that his term ends at the end of this academic year and Dr. Patricia Lebensohn will begin her term as Chair at the beginning of next academic year (AY 17-18). Last year she was elected vice-chair and the understanding was that she will take over as Chair when his term is over this summer. Sometime over the next year the new committee will elect a new vice chair. Dr. Lebensohn has been attending the meetings and is ready to begin her term. No objections from the committee members.

2. Voting Items:

a. Minutes from April 19, 2017 TEPC Meeting

Minutes were approved without revision.

b. Level 2 Report on the Clinical Curriculum

Level 2 Report was accepted by committee members.

Dr. Paul Weissburg led the discussion. Dr. Weissburg noted that a vast majority of the work was done by Susan Ellis, Mike Gura, Bryna Koch and the CRS committee and they should receive recognition for creating the report. Our program evaluation is divided into a Level 1 report which is the evaluation of individual blocks and courses and clerkships followed by two Level 2 reports. The first deals with the preclinical curriculum and which was completed in June of 2016 and then the clinical curriculum evaluation. These are triannual reports. Lastly, there is the Level 3 report which is an evaluation of the curriculum as a whole and that is a quadrennial

Minutes submitted by Andrea Lopez
Curricular Affairs

report which should be coming out shortly. This report deals with AY12-13, AY13-14 and AY14-15. The structure of the report is comprised of two major sections; outcomes and processes. The outcomes category help answer the question "Did the participants in the curriculum achieve the intended changes, and knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior?" What are the outputs? The process is the input. "Was the curriculum delivered the right way, to the right audience at the right time?" One of the major challenges facing the clinical curriculum is the assessment of students in clerkships. Grading distribution was discussed. Progress has been made over the last 3 years in this area but looking into the following year (AY15-16), one can see much improvement. Inclusion of the NBME shelf exam is a significant step in that direction and gradual introduction of OSCEs in clerkships will help provide additional objective grading points which will help in the future. The data overall indicates our clerkship students are performing at or near the national average but in some areas they are performing higher than the national average.

A good take away from this report can be the recommendations that have been implemented or are in the process of being worked on. For example, in academic year 2014-15, all clerkship-specific objectives were reviewed by the clerkship directors, in conjunction with personnel from Curricular Affairs. The objectives were revised to be stated in terms of expected learning outcomes where appropriate. Another example is that all patient encounter requirements are now being entered into the ArizonaMed Online Database clerkship record. These examples helped the college with the LCME citations received during the 2014 LCME site visit. The instructional methods recommendations set the pace for what is going on now within the Clinical Curriculum workgroup and the Teaching and Learning Modalities workgroup both of which stem from the Curriculum Reorganization Project currently underway. Most of the instructional quality and faculty instructional development recommendations had already been addressed in the prior report by Dr. Karen Spear Ellinwood. Much of the work related to the student performance assessment recommendations is currently underway. Dr. Weissburg is on both groups and they are working on several of these issues.

We continue to improve the final composite clerkship grade distribution issue. We still need to figure out exact settings of where they should be and how do they get there. We can consider developing guidelines for graded distribution for electives although this is a tricky area and not much progress has been made on it. The College continues the use of a standardized approach to use of syllabi, examinations, H&P tracking, and feedback surveys. Discussion on incorporating core EPAs is underway.

The clerkship grades for AY 15-16 look a lot better. It should be noted that Medicine, OB-GYN and Surgery, on the shelf exams, our students are consistently at or above the national average. Neurology has made a big jump upwards. Overall, clerkships are moving upwards. For every clerkship, looking between AY14-15 (GQ), in every single case the percentile has gone up suggesting we are doing something right. The instructional quality ratings for clerkships are extremely high and consistent across the clerkships.

In summary, it should be noted we are making progress, there is work to be done but we are working on them, and issues are being addressed.

Questions? Are all items that can be mapped to the GQ being mapped to it? For example, instructors getting great grades on our surveys are not always the case on our GQ results. The learning environment items are drawn from the GQ. Mike Gura will make sure all items that can be mapped to the GQ are in fact being asked.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of board exam scores for gaining entrance into residency programs. The challenge is to develop other metrics to look at rather than focusing on board scores (i.e. communication skills). Holistic assessment that could be used across all schools is the key.

The members also discussed the timing and usefulness of this report. Should we be thinking of a different timeline? The release of this report was delayed because Bryna started it, left and then Paul took over. Noting it's a triennial report, how useful is 3 years of data? The Level 2 report fulfills a function but is it possible to design a system that fulfills that function better? How is this report going to hold the medical education program accountable? The recommendation section is important and this part is what we are held accountable to. For the data? It provides a benchmark for us to use but it would be helpful to use as a longitudinal study. Perhaps a yearly summary report to put everything into perspective could be developed.

Acceptance of report was voted on; no objections.

c. Attendance policy

Sonia de Leon and Diane Poskus presented the revisions to the current Attendance Policy. The revisions are as follows and pertain to years 1-3:

Attendance sign-in sheet: It is an honor code violation if a student, while attending a required session, signs in for anyone other than themselves or if they sign in and immediately leave the session. Recently, a professionalism complaint was submitted to the Professionalism Program stating some students were signing in and leaving required sessions or having friends sign in for them. Therefore, it was decided to add language stating it would be an Honor Code violation if students did this.

Bereavement leave is now an excused absence. The revision emulates the University of Arizona main campus policy; 3 days for in state funerals with an additional 2 days for out of state funerals. If taking more than five days the student needs to ask for a Leave of Absence through Student Affairs. Exceptions to the 5 day policy would need to be handled on a case by case basis involving the Student Affairs Dean, the course director, Societies Mentor, etc.

Transition to Clerkship and Intersession are now required courses. These two courses had to be specifically added into the policy even though the policy had listed "all courses and clerkships" are required. Personal days may not be taken during Transition to Clerkship and Intersession because they are such short courses. If a student exceeds the maximum number of absences allowed, they need to retake the clerkship. If there is a pattern of excessive absences, the student needs to meet with the Dean of Student Affairs to see if improvements can be made.

The question of whether or not these changes blocked students in was raised and whether or not there were alternatives. In Intersessions, they can write essays rather than repeat the whole week. Intersessions will be a 2 week block next year. It was suggested to consider including this now in the policy. A half-day off can be granted for a one week course and then one day off for a two week course. This would prevent having to bring back these additional changes to the committee for review. It was also suggested to not specifically state Intersession and Transition to Clerkship in the policy; simply state "courses." Diane will update the policy with the above suggestions.

Motion to accept policy as amended.

d. Academic Calendar for 2018-19

Sonia de Leon introduced the AY 18-19 calendar which shows the 18 month curriculum for the class of 2021 and 2022; this includes the overlap months. The calendar has been reviewed by all departments. Of note, the PAL (Personalized Active Learning) portion of the schedule will be fleshed out during Stage 2 of the curriculum renewal process.

Calendar was voted on and approved; no objections.

e. Draft- revised TEPC bylaws

Dr. Sanders distributed the potential changes to the by-laws and policies of TEPC. The by-laws

are outdated because TEP-C was a subcommittee under the Phoenix/Tucson combined educational policy committee. His only major suggestion was to change the terms from 5 years to 3 years with one renewable term. Most committees in the CoM are three year terms with the option to renew. There was some discussion to allowing just one renewable term and if there is an institutional want to standardized terms. These changes will be reviewed by Anne Wright in Faculty Affairs for further review. One member suggesting make it a 4 year term to align with the student service of 4 years.

Student representation on the committee was also discussed. It was suggested that there should be one student from each class elected by Student Government. “Four students representing each year from the medical school will be elected by the Student Government to represent the students.” This gives the Student Government some flexibility if a student drops off the committee or goes on LOA to fill that slot appropriately. Dr. Sanders will work on the wording of the by-laws document. He basically removed everything that had to do with Phoenix in addition to changing wording from OMSE to Curricular Affairs. There is a two year term for the chair. At the beginning of the second year a vice-chair is elected with that person taking over the chair position the following year, thus, serving as the vice chair for one year before assuming the role of the chair for two years. It was voted on to suggest three year terms with ability to renew for an additional term. Ultimately this isn’t up to this committee to approve but we can put forth the language and submit it for approval.

3. Discussion items:
None

Meeting adjourned. The next meeting is July 19, 2017

ACTION ITEMS			
	Items(s)	Assigned to	Target Date
1.	Attendance Policy revisions to reflect the above suggestions	Diane Poskus	ASAP
2.	TEPC By-laws revisions to reflect the above suggestions; to be reviewed by Faculty Affairs followed by vote from CoM faculty	Art Sanders, MD	ASAP